

1 Gender differences in perceived health in relation to working conditions and socio-
2 economic status in Spain, 2014-2017.

3 Short title: Health status of Spanish working women

4

5 Amanda Godoy¹, Araceli Rojo^{1*}, Luisa Delgado¹, José J Martín¹, M. Teresa Sánchez¹
6 and M. Puerto López del Amo¹

7

8 ¹ Applied Economics Department, University of Granada, Granada, Spain

9

10 * Corresponding author

11 e-mail: gallegoburin@ugr.es (AR)

12

13 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

14

15

16

17 **Abstract**

18

19 A gender perspective was used to analyze how socio-economic status and per capita
20 public health expenditure are associated to perceived health among the Spanish
21 population between the years 2014 and 2017. Using multilevel methodologies (looking
22 at year, individual, and region) and linear specification, the longitudinal microdata files
23 from the Survey on Living Conditions were analyzed. The results point at low educational
24 levels being a factor for worse perceived health among women, while for the same group
25 income appears to have a protective influence. On the other hand, women are not
26 negatively affected by unemployment, unlike men. Regional per capita public health
27 expenditure is not associated with perceived health in either men nor women.

28

29 **Keywords**

30 Perceived health, Gender, Unemployment, Poverty, Longitudinal multilevel analysis.

31

32 **Introduction**

33 The theoretical framework concerning the social determinants of health posits that
34 variables such as working status, educational attainment level, and socio-economic
35 context are unequally linked to health [1-5]. In that frame of reference, gender appears as
36 a particularly influential axis of inequality [6, 7].

37 Biological differences between sexes are insufficient to explain diverging health trends,
38 which have been proven to be preventable and avoidable. Unlike sex, i. e. a set of
39 biological attributes, the concept of gender derives from socially constructed cultural

40 conventions, roles, and behaviors ascribed to people of the female, male, or other sexes
41 [8]. Socially and culturally constructed gender norms determine the roles and
42 opportunities afforded to all individuals and arise as strong structural determinants of
43 health with major yet different implications for women and men [6, 9]. Such differences
44 become problematic when they give rise to inequality and discrimination, which are
45 particularly detrimental to women. Gender power dynamics, which are among the main
46 causes of gender inequality, are also some of the strongest social determinants of health,
47 with an undeniable effect on how people are born, grow up, live, work, get old, and finally
48 die [10].

49 The main goal of the present work is to analyze, from a gender perspective, the association
50 between perceived health and socio-economic status. Additionally, this study examines
51 the extent to which regional public health expenditure affects the perceived health of men
52 and women in a given region. For the purposes of this study, socio-economic status is
53 defined along three dimensions: educational level, economic status, and working status.
54 A set of instrumental variables have been selected for each dimension in order to provide
55 a well-rounded description of the position each individual occupies.

56 For the most part, the relevant literature consists of partial analyses of the relation between
57 health and certain social and economic variables, such as the role of unemployment or
58 poverty on health [11-17]. In contrast, the present study considers the link between socio-
59 economic status and health from a global point of view, by simultaneously contemplating
60 the influence of educational level, economic status, and the individual's working status
61 as the three key dimensions of general socio-economic status.

62 Educational level has been proven to be a major social determinant of health. Most
63 analyses confirm that high educational attainment is commonly linked to improved health
64 and increased longevity with good health, when comparisons are drawn with individuals

65 with low levels of education [18-20]. However, the specifics of how the benefits of
66 education are unevenly distributed among women and men are not sufficiently explained,
67 and the conclusions attained are far from unanimous. Given that women are generally at
68 a disadvantage in the distribution of socio-economic resources such as power, authority,
69 earnings, household income, and general wealth, their health and survival might be more
70 dependent on their education than in the case of men. This study examines whether the
71 beneficial influence of education on health is particularly strong for women, and whether
72 education by itself may suffice to overcome gender differences in perceived health.

73 Previous research has concluded that lower educational levels are particularly detrimental
74 to the perceived health of women when compared with similarly characterized men [19,
75 21-23].

76 A recent analysis carried out in Spain among an adult population established that the
77 association between low educational level and poor self-perceived health was particularly
78 strong among women [20]. However, an analysis of the active population in Spain failed
79 to find gender disparities concerning the effect of education on health, although it showed
80 that women's health is lower among less educated individuals, mainly due to job
81 insecurity and the specific characteristics of households [18].

82 Some research on psychological welfare suggests that education is more beneficial to
83 women than men [24, 25], maybe because the lack of other resources makes women
84 particularly dependent on their own education to achieve certain levels of welfare. Thus,
85 poorly educated women may suffer from more and worse health problems because they
86 have less resources to draw from [25-28]. The theory of resource substitution, according
87 to which the absence of one or several socio-economic resources may be offset by
88 drawing more intensely from the existing ones, predicts that the benefits of education on
89 health and survival are larger for women, with physical deterioration being more intensely

90 reduced for women than for men as their educational level increases. Thus, the gender
91 gap in physical status essentially vanishes as individuals reach college levels of education.
92 In contrast, the theory of resource multiplication implies precisely the opposite, that
93 education should be more beneficial to men than women as they are able to derive greater
94 rewards from it in the labor market, such as increased authority and income [25, 26].
95 The critical link between women's education and health has been emphasized even more
96 by evidence concerning the discrimination faced by women who attempt to access the
97 labor market and the gender pay gap, which has increased as a result of the latest financial
98 recession [29].

99 Individual economic status is a major social determinant of health, with all evidence
100 pointing at income levels, poverty, and inequality being associated with worsened
101 perceived health [30]. Sarti et al. (2019) found that in Italy decreased socio-economic
102 status is associated to poorer self-perceived health [31], while Akanni et al. (2022)
103 concluded that, in Germany, the increase and stability of household income had beneficial
104 effects on health [32]. Income inequality has increased sharply over the last few decades,
105 which may have contributed to perpetuate or exacerbate health disparities. In turn, poor
106 health reduces income, which creates a negative feedback loop commonly known as the
107 health-poverty trap [33]. The financial crisis modified working conditions and levels of
108 employment, increasing job insecurity and decreasing wage income, which raised the
109 share of those at risk of poverty and social exclusion [34]. In that regard, the World Health
110 Organization deems poverty to be the strongest determinant of poor health at the
111 individual level [35], with women being particularly vulnerable in that regard as the
112 effects of want are added to gender inequalities and the so-called feminization of poverty,
113 which affects women more commonly and intensely than men [36]. Generally speaking,
114 poor living conditions and material deprivation have a detrimental effect on people's

115 health [37]. Such circumstances, particularly when prolonged in time, undermine their
116 working status, erode their human and social capital, worsen their health, and brand them
117 with stigma [38].

118 As far as social deprivation is concerned, the strong link between poverty and health is a
119 widely established fact, notwithstanding the complex nature of both concepts and their
120 relation [39]. As for material deprivation as a contributor to social deprivation, little
121 empirical evidence has been gathered. Amendola et al. (2020) found, for the period 2007-
122 2011, that although social deprivation in absolute terms had increased for men as well as
123 women, the differences between both groups had been reduced: men had become more
124 socially deprived, but women remained in the lead in the same regard [40]. The latest
125 AROPE report (at risk of poverty and social exclusion) available for Spain [41] points at
126 women being more intensely affected than men by material deprivation, as well as by the
127 general AROPE score. These conclusions highlight the need to focus efforts on the female
128 population.

129 Working status, and in particular the employed-unemployed dichotomy, has traditionally
130 played a central role in the analysis of social inequalities concerning health. The intensity
131 and magnitude of the Great Financial Crisis had a profound effect on the Spanish labor
132 market, and the resulting landscape demands that we take a closer look at the experience
133 of unemployment and how it is able to affect the health of women and men in a different
134 way [42]. Previous analyses on the impact that unemployment has on health have
135 revealed, in most cases, a negative influence [21, 43-45]. However, there is no consensus
136 regarding the impact of unemployment on perceived health from a gender perspective.
137 Norström et al. (2014) failed to find a clear, gender-determined inequality effect of
138 unemployment on health [46]. Meanwhile, Drydakis (2015) found that, during the intense
139 depression caused by the financial crisis in Greece, the detrimental effect of

140 unemployment on health was stronger for women than for men [47]. In contrast with
141 Drydakis, Antonakakis and Collins (2014) reached a different set of conclusions in their
142 analysis of the Greek situation, as they found a starker effect of the financial recession
143 and its austerity measures on male than on female suicide rates [48]. Other studies have
144 similarly suggested that the effects of austerity, layoffs, and unemployment have had a
145 stronger effect on the mental health of men than on that of women [49-52]. Along such
146 lines, Calzón et al. (2017) found evidence of unemployment as a risk factor for bad self-
147 rated health among men, but not women. However, the same study linked lower income
148 levels to bad self-rated health to a greater extent in the case of women [22]. As for France,
149 Ronchetti and Terriau (2019) did not find a negative link between long-term
150 unemployment and self-perceived health for men nor for women [53]. Buffel et al. (2015),
151 applying a multilevel framework to data extracted from the European Social Survey (2006
152 and 2012 rounds), looked into the relation between unemployment and mental health
153 across 20 European countries, and found a larger increase in the likelihood of undergoing
154 depression for men than for women [54]. In light of these studies, it becomes necessary
155 to analyze how such effects may be modified by periods of economic recovery while
156 keeping in mind the singularities of the Spanish economy, characterized by one of the
157 highest unemployment rates in the European Union and a largely unstable and insecure
158 labor market in which women experience higher rates of unemployment [34].
159 Lastly, we carried out an analysis of regional per capita health expenditure and perceived
160 health, accounting for the significant differences in this variable across regions. The
161 Public Health Expenditure Statistical Report published by the Spanish Ministry of Health
162 (Estadística de Gasto Sanitario Público, 2022), reveals a 48% gap between the highest
163 spending region (Basque Country) and the lowest (Andalusia) [55]. The differences are
164 significant: even accounting for the Basque Country's disparate legislative and

165 administrative framework, the differences amount to 38%, only slightly less elevated.
166 Among low-income countries, higher health expenditure seems to be linked to significant
167 improvements in health status, which suggests that public policy may make a big
168 difference in this regard [56, 57]. However, among high-income countries, additional
169 health expenditure increases appear to be largely unrelated to health status improvements,
170 which implies that increases in expenditure alone do not suffice to improve health to a
171 significant degree [56-58]. Other studies, such as that carried out by Heijink et al. (2013)
172 for 14 Western countries, did find a statistically significant link between health
173 expenditure and avoidable mortality [59]. Nixon and Ulmann (2006) examined the
174 relation between health care expenditure and health outcomes (average life expectancy at
175 birth and infant mortality rate) to conclude that, although health expenditure has
176 contributed significantly to ameliorate infant mortality, it has only caused marginal
177 improvements to life expectancy in EU countries during the period under analysis [60].
178 Some researchers have been able to identify that women's educational attainment levels,
179 technological improvements, per capita income, unequal distributions of income, and
180 certain cultural differences are behind some of the strongest improvements in health
181 outcomes, far beyond increases in health expenditure [61, 62].
182 To summarize, in Spain as well as internationally, the available evidence concerning the
183 link between socio-economic status, gender, and perceived health is far from conclusive
184 or unanimous. The present study takes a wide longitudinal database to explore how health
185 gender differences are affected by educational attainment level, economic status, and
186 working status. The results of this analysis may be useful to suggest specific public
187 policies with the potential to reduce health status gaps caused by the disparate social and
188 economic status of women and men. Additionally, the following pages also looks into

189 how the differences in public health expenditure of each region relate to the perceived
190 health status of their citizens.

191 **Materials and methods**

192 **Scope of the study**

193 A database was built using the microdata files from the Survey on Living Conditions
194 (2014-2017), comprising 17,027 individuals aged between 16 and 60, and 41,111
195 observations [63]. Per capita public health expenditure was extracted from the Public
196 Health Expenditure Statistical Report published by the Spanish Ministry of Health
197 (*Estadística de Gasto Sanitario Público*) [55].

198

199 **Data analysis**

200 Taking into account the chronological and hierarchical structure of the data, a multilevel
201 (three-level) longitudinal model was estimated. The first level was the year, the second
202 the individual, and the third level was the region. Analytically:

$$203 \quad y_{ijk} = \beta_0 + \sum_{h=1}^H \beta_h x_{hijk} + \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m x_{mik} + e_{ijk} + u_{jk} + c_k \quad (1)$$

204 where y_{ijk} is the dependent variable (perceived health), taking values 1-5, for the year i ,
205 being $i = 2014, \dots, 2017$; the individual j , being $j = 1, \dots, 17,027$; and region k , being k
206 $= 1, \dots, 17$. β_0 represents the independent term; x_{hijk} are the individual explanatory
207 variables; β_h and α_m their associated coefficients, with $h = 1, \dots, H$; x_{mik} are the explanatory
208 variables at the ecological level, k and α_m their associated coefficients, with $m = 1, \dots, M$.
209 The error term divides the unexplained part in three, one for each hierarchical level: c_k at
210 the ecological level, u_{jk} for the individual, and e_{ijk} for each year.

211 Multilevel models have been proven to be a good fit for hierarchical structures that
212 include several levels of information, and in which individuals share certain features by
213 virtue of belonging to the same higher level (the region). They are also a good choice
214 when repeated measures exist, given that they allow for variance to be estimated at each
215 level. Multilevel models thus avoid both the ecological fallacy (in which aggregated data
216 are interpreted at the individual level) and the atomistic fallacy (in which individual data
217 are interpreted at the aggregated level) [64]. The software employed to analyze the data
218 was Stata 15.

219 The dependent variable, perceived health, takes values 1-5, with 1 for very good health
220 and 5 for very bad health. Perceived health is a proxy variable for morbi-mortality,
221 commonly employed in health and living conditions surveys. It is one of the indicators of
222 choice used to monitor gender inequalities and their determinants in matters of health [65-
223 67].

224 Individually, the variables of interest are those characterizing the socio-economic status
225 of subjects: educational attainment level, economic status, and working status.

226 Educational level is defined as the amount of formal instruction successfully completed,
227 and is divided into the primary, secondary, and college level.

228 Economic status has been characterized by means of four instrumental variables. The first
229 is income, on the one hand, and on the other are three indicators that describe social
230 deprivation: the AROPE score and two of its components, severe material deprivation
231 and low work intensity in the household (LWIH).

232 Income was measured using the equivalent available per capita income of households at
233 constant levels, for the last year of the per capita income series and logarithmically
234 transformed.

235 The risk of poverty and social exclusion was measured through the AROPE score. This
236 indicator expands on the traditional relative poverty score by combining it with severe
237 material deprivation and low work intensity in the household. This provides a
238 multidimensional picture of poverty and social exclusion. The AROPE score thus
239 comprises three sub-indicators representing three distinct population sets: individuals at
240 risk of poverty, individuals suffering from severe material deprivation, and individuals
241 living in households characterized by low work intensity. Whenever one such indicator
242 is present, an individual can be safely described as being at risk of poverty or social
243 exclusion [41]. The variable *low work intensity* refers to individuals living in households
244 in which those of working age did work less than 20% of their full potential in the year
245 before the survey. As for severe material deprivation, this describes the share of the
246 population living in households lacking in at least four out of nine specific quality-of-life
247 items [68].

248 Finally, working status has been characterized using six categories: employed,
249 unemployed, student, homemaker, retired, and other inactive status.

250 Age and chronic illness (dichotomous variable) were used as control variables.

251 For the third level, which deals with the region, per capita public health expenditure was
252 used. A one-year delay was introduced in order to better reflect any potential link with
253 the perceived health of residents in the region.

254 All monetary variables, such as income and health expenditure, have been expressed
255 using 2017 prices.

256

257

258 **Results**

259 Table 1 shows the frequency of each variable in the model, split by gender.

Table 1. Descriptive statistical values, according to gender, of the variables used to measure the relation of socio-economic and working status with perceived health for Spain between 2014 and 2017.

		WOMEN					MEN				
		2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Categorical variables		n=2668	n=4997	n=7104	n=6087	n=20856	n=2573	n=4817	n=6966	n=5899	n=20255
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Perceived health	1	19.72	18.69	17.23	22.41	19.41	21.14	20.78	20.13	24.17	21.59
	2	60.31	63.18	64.20	61.00	62.52	63.04	62.40	63.58	60.91	62.45
	3	15.74	14.45	15.05	13.34	14.49	12.16	13.29	13.36	12.04	12.81
	4	3.26	2.94	2.83	2.73	2.88	2.99	2.70	2.41	2.29	2.52
	5	0.97	0.74	0.69	0.53	0.69	0.66	0.83	0.52	0.59	0.63
Chronic illness	1	23.61	24.13	23.10	21.24	22.87	21.53	23.87	21.60	19.33	21.47
	0	76.39	75.87	76.90	78.76	77.13	78.47	76.13	78.40	80.67	78.53
Educational level	Primary	12.29	10.51	9.87	8.00	9.79	13.84	11.86	11.25	9.26	11.14
	Secondary	54.39	55.03	54.89	54.51	54.75	58.09	58.39	58.73	58.92	58.63
	College	33.32	34.46	35.24	37.49	35.46	28.07	29.75	30.02	31.82	30.23
Working status	Employed	51.37	53.07	54.30	56.70	54.33	60.70	64.50	64.45	67.46	64.87
	Unemployed	21.62	20.50	19.27	15.75	18.83	23.22	19.44	18.03	15.45	18.27
	Student	10.46	11.04	11.20	11.06	11.01	10.42	10.31	11.67	10.91	10.96
	Homemaker	12.76	12.01	11.56	12.12	11.97	0.07	0.08	0.14	0.15	0.12
	Retired	0.25	0.15	0.26	0.51	0.31	0.87	0.76	0.87	1.30	0.97
	Other inactive	3.54	3.23	3.50	3.87	3.55	4.72	4.91	4.84	4.73	4.81
Severe material deprivation	1	6.35	4.67	4.30	3.05	4.29	5.70	4.59	3.98	3.10	4.09
	0	93.65	95.33	95.70	96.95	95.71	94.30	95.41	96.02	96.90	95.91
Low work intensity in the household (LWIH)	1	20.90	17.11	16.16	14.39	16.48	19.44	16.65	15.20	12.94	15.43
	0	79.10	82.89	83.84	85.61	83.52	80.56	83.35	84.80	87.06	84.57
AROPE	1	35.24	31.87	30.91	29.39	31.25	33.60	30.46	29.10	26.92	29.36
	0	64.76	68.13	69.09	70.61	68.75	66.40	69.54	70.90	73.08	70.64
Continuous variables		mean (SD)					mean (SD)				
Age	Age	40.53	40.61	41.07	41.33	40.96	39.72	40.21	40.41	40.78	40.38
		(12.43)	(12.58)	(12.68)	(12.83)	(12.67)	(12.50)	(12.65)	(12.79)	(12.93)	(12.77)
Household income	nldeflat_equivincome	9.41	9.45	9.49	9.50	9.47	9.44	9.47	9.51	9.53	9.50
		(0.74)	(0.76)	(0.76)	(0.75)	(0.76)	(0.71)	(0.74)	(0.72)	(0.72)	(0.72)
Per capita health expenditure	healthexp/pc	1293.42	1385.97	1412.39	1410.20	1390.16	1288.63	1387.39	1412.28	1411.84	1390.47
		(150.23)	(146.46)	(159.10)	(156.12)	(158.89)	(149.44)	(145.69)	(159.10)	(156.43)	(159.15)

Source: Prepared by the authors using data from Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) (2020). Carencia Material. Carencia Material Severa [Material Deprivation. Severe Material Deprivation]. Recovered from https://www.ine.es/ss/Satellite?L=es_ES&c=INESeccion_C&cid=1259925456180&p=1254735110672&pagename=ProductosYServicios%2FPYSLayou¶m1=PYSDetalle¶m3=1259924822888, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) (2022). Encuesta de condiciones de vida. Resultados. Available from: https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=1254736176807&menu=resultados&idp=1254735976608#!/tabs-1254736195153 and Ministerio de Sanidad del Gobierno de España (2022) Estadística de Gasto Sanitario Público (EGSP) 2019: Principales resultados. Available from: <https://www.mscls.gob.es/estadEstudios/estadisticas/docs/EGSP2008/egspPrincipalesResultados.pdf>.

261 According to the analysis, the share of individuals describing their health as fair, bad, or
262 very bad has increased between 2014 and 2016, and only slightly decreased in 2017. Such
263 temporary respite affected women and men alike. As for the variables of interest, the
264 prevailing educational level for women and men in the whole series under analysis is
265 secondary education, followed by college-level studies. Regarding economic status, both
266 women and men enjoyed higher income levels in the last year under analysis: 2017. The
267 three indicators used to describe social deprivation successively decreased over the 2014-
268 2017 period for both genders alike. Finally, and as far as working status is concerned, for
269 the period under analysis a sustained increase was observed in the number of employed
270 individuals, with a corresponding decrease in unemployment rates, also for women as
271 well as men. The working status category displaying the largest gap is that of
272 homemakers, which includes almost 12% of women but only 0.12% of men.
273 Table 2 displays the results of estimations.

274 Table 2. Results of applying the random intercept linear multilevel model to the exploration of associations between individual working and socio-economic
 275 status and perceived health.

Variable	WOMEN			MEN		
	Null model	Explanatory model		Null model	Explanatory model	
	Coefficient (SE)	p value	95% Conf. Interval	Coefficient (SE)	p value	95% Conf. Interval
Constant	1.527 (0.123)	0.000	(1.287 1.768)	1.189 (0.220)	0.000	(0.757 1.620)
Age	0.012 (0.001)	0.000	(0.010 0.013)	0.013 (0.001)	0.000	(0.011 0.014)
Chronic illness	0.766 (0.014)	0.000	(0.738 0.794)	0.701 (0.022)	0.000	(0.659 0.744)
Working status						
- Employed	Reference			Reference		
- Unemployed	0.013 (0.026)	0.617	(-0.038 0.065)	0.069 (0.016)	0.000	(0.037 0.102)
- Student	-0.062 (0.019)	0.001	(-0.099 -0.024)	-0.034 (0.014)	0.015	(-0.061 -0.006)
- Homemaker	0.001 (0.012)	0.934	(-0.023 0.026)	0.045 (0.157)	0.776	(-0.264 0.353)
- Retired	0.115 (0.097)	0.234	(-0.074 0.305)	0.164 (0.062)	0.008	(0.043 0.285)
- Other inactive	0.428 (0.045)	0.000	(0.339 0.516)	0.563 (0.037)	0.000	(0.490 0.635)
Education level						
- Primary	0.070 (0.013)	0.000	(0.044 0.097)	0.028 (0.017)	0.090	(-0.004 0.061)
- Secondary	Reference			Reference		
- College	-0.077 (0.012)	0.000	(-0.100 -0.053)	-0.098 (0.019)	0.000	(-0.135 -0.060)
Social deprivation:						
- LWIH	0.053 (0.025)	0.034	(0.004 0.103)	0.036 (0.014)	0.014	(0.007 0.064)
- Severe material deprivation	0.129 (0.025)	0.000	(0.081 0.178)	0.158 (0.029)	0.000	(0.101 0.215)
- AROPE	0.046 (0.024)	0.052	(-0.000 0.093)	0.058 (0.016)	0.000	(0.027 0.089)
- nl_def_equiv. income	-0.028 (0.010)	0.006	(-0.048 -0.008)	-0.007 (0.015)	0.617	(-0.037 0.022)
Per capita health expend.	0.000 (0.000)	0.404	(-0.000 0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.208	(-0.000 0.000)

LWIH (Low Work Intensity in the Household) AROPE (At Risk of Poverty and Social Exclusion)

Source: Prepared by the authors using data from Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) (2020). Carencia Material. Carencia Material Severa [Material Deprivation. Severe Material Deprivation]. Recovered from https://www.ine.es/ss/Satellite?L=es_ES&c=INESeccion_C&cid=1259925456180&p=1254735110672&pagename=ProductosYServicios%2FPYSLayout¶m1=PYSDetalle¶m3=1259924822888, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) (2022). Encuesta de condiciones de vida. Resultados. Recovered from https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=1254736176807&menu=resultados&idp=1254735976608#!tabs-1254736195153 and Ministerio de Sanidad del Gobierno de España (2022) Estadística de Gasto Sanitario Público (EGSP) 2019: Principales resultados. Recovered from: <https://www.msbs.gob.es/estadEstudios/estadisticas/docs/EGSP2008/egspPrincipalesResultados.pdf>.

277 Regarding the variables of interest that characterize socio-economic status, for women
278 statistically significant associations appeared with educational attainment level (for
279 education-related variables); income, severe material deprivation, and living in a
280 household with low work intensity (for economic status-related variables); and belonging
281 to the *other inactive* or *student* categories (for working status-related variables).

282 Having successfully completed only a primary-level education is a risk factor for women
283 ($\beta= 0.070, p=0.00$), whereas having received a college-level education has a protective
284 effect ($\beta= - 0.077, p=0.00$).

285 The following results have been observed with respect to the economic status of women:
286 Income is a protective factor ($\beta= - 0.028, p < 0.05$), whereas severe material deprivation
287 ($\beta= 0.129, p = 0.00$), living in a low work intensity household ($\beta= 0.053, p < 0.05$) and
288 the AROPE rating ($\beta= 0.046, p < 0.10$) are definite risk factors.

289 Finally, as regards working status, only belonging to the *other inactive* ($\beta= 0.428, p=0.00$)
290 o *student* categories ($\beta= - 0.062, p < 0.05$) yielded statistically significant results. It is
291 worth pointing out that all other working status categories lacked statistical significance,
292 notably being unemployed ($\beta= 0.013, p=0.617$) and being a homemaker ($\beta= 0.001,$
293 $p=0.934$).

294 The per capita public health expenditure variable was not statistically significant ($\beta=$
295 $0.000, p=0.404$) and therefore is not associated with better or worse perceived health
296 among women.

297 In the case of men, the multilevel analysis shows that, as far as education is concerned,
298 only having received a college-level education has a statistically significant protective
299 effect ($\beta= - 0.098, p=0.00$). As for economic status, risk factors include severe material
300 deprivation, living in a low work intensity household, and the AROPE rating. Finally, as

301 regards working status, unlike in the case of women unemployment and retirement
302 appeared as risk factors.

303 The analysis of the economic status of men yielded the following results:

304 Income did not reach statistical significance ($\beta = -0.007$, $p = 0.617$), whereas severe
305 material deprivation ($\beta = 0.158$, $p = 0.000$), living in a household with low work intensity
306 ($\beta = 0.036$, $p < 0.05$), and the AROPE score ($\beta = 0.058$, $p = 0.000$) appeared as risk factors.

307 Finally, and concerning working status, being unemployed ($\beta = 0.069$, $p = 0.000$) and
308 retired ($\beta = 0.164$, $p < 0.05$) were definite risk factors for men.

309 The public health expenditure variable was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.000$,
310 $p = 0.208$), which implies that regional per capita public health expenditure is not
311 associated with the improved or worsened perceived health of men.

312 To summarize, the main differences observed by gender are the following:

313 – In matters of educational level, for women having received only a primary
314 education worsened their perceived health by 0.07 points (in contrast with being
315 in possession of a secondary education). Conversely, for men a primary education
316 level was not a risk factor for health.

317 – As regards economic status, income was a protective factor for the good health of
318 Spanish women. A 10% increase in income improves the health of women by two
319 percentage points. In contrast, for men income did not have any noticeable effect.

320 – As for working status, the perceived health of Spanish women does not appear to
321 be affected by unemployment, whereas for men it decreases their self-rated
322 health status. Unemployed men were, on average, 0.07 percentage points below
323 their employed peers in perceived health. Similarly, being retired does not have
324 any effect in the case of women, but for men it worsens their self-perceived

325 health. Retired men report a health status 0.16 percentage points below those
326 who are employed.

327 Therefore, it may be stated that variables describing economic status, be they severe
328 material deprivation, LWIH, or the AROPE score, have a deleterious effect on the health
329 of both women and men.

330 In the analysis of gender differences, for women a low educational level is a risk factor
331 and higher income has a protective effect, whereas retirement and unemployment are
332 negatively associated with the health of men and men alone. Regional per capita public
333 health expenditure is not statistically associated to the perceived health of women nor
334 men.

335

336

337 **Discussion**

338 The goal of this analysis was to provide a gender perspective on the association between
339 perceived the health and socio-economic status of the Spanish population between the
340 years of 2014 and 2017.

341 This multilevel analysis employed data from the Living Conditions Survey and from
342 several regional sources, and its results suggest that, although there are certain common
343 factors which affect the health of women and men alike, others have a differential effect.
344 This points at strong gender differences as far as health and its socio-economic
345 determinants are concerned.

346 Firstly, our results show that a low educational attainment level is a risk factor for women,
347 but not for men. In agreement with previous studies [20-22, 57], we found that women's
348 health is further improved by the intrinsic rewards of education, as they have fewer other
349 resources from which they can draw in the absence of a degree. Whenever women are
350 able to complete an education, their health is improved, often at a higher rate than for
351 men. This illustrates the point that women are especially reliant on their own education
352 in order to thrive, and therefore improvements in education may reduce their health-
353 damaging behaviors further than those of men [25]. This result suggests that public
354 investments in women's education translate to a reduction in health-related gender
355 differences.

356 As for the effects of economic status, results show that income is a protective factor for
357 the health of women, but not for men. Generally speaking, people with higher income
358 levels enjoy improved health as they have access to the resources required to prevent and
359 treat a variety of conditions and are therefore better equipped to face critical and stressful
360 events throughout their lives [30]. Women, however, are still at an economic

361 disadvantage, and for that reason higher income levels may be a stronger predictor of
362 their good health than of men's [69-71].

363 Regarding the three dimensions of social deprivation under analysis (severe material
364 deprivation, low work intensity in the household, and the AROPE score), they appear to
365 negatively affect the health of women and men alike, consistently with previous studies
366 such as López del Amo et al. (2018) [19].

367 With respect to working status, unemployment does not have an effect on the perceived
368 health of women, but it worsens that of men, as previously reported by Calzón et al.
369 (2017) [22]. The myth of the nuclear family and the concept of manhood as a function of
370 a man's ability to provide for their family still lie behind currently prevailing notions of
371 masculinity and patriarchy [50, 51, 72]. These misconceptions have failed to adapt to new
372 landscapes of family and work life, which may lead to increased physical and mental
373 health problems for men in times of economic turmoil and uncertainty [73]. As reported
374 by the World Bank (2011) men see access to the labor market as their only avenue for
375 empowerment, and any setback in that regard makes them vulnerable [49]. In that sense,
376 it must be noted that the collapse of the building industry at the beginning of the financial
377 crisis left many people unemployed for a long time, with male unemployment rates
378 increasing at a much faster pace than female rates. An analysis of national health surveys
379 shows that the mental health of such individuals was severely affected during that period.

380 Lastly, observations of per capita public health expenditure failed to reveal any effect on
381 the perceived health of women nor men. While it is widely understood that it should have
382 a strong effect on the health status of individuals, in developed countries additional
383 expenditure is often unrelated to improvements in perceived health, as previously
384 described in the literature [56-58]. This does not discount the fact that public policy

385 makers should always be on the lookout for new opportunities to improve health
386 outcomes through regionally distributed health expenditure and efficient policies.
387 Furthermore, statistics on health outcomes may be improved by a reassignment of
388 resources, from healthcare to social programs. This is particularly the case of policies
389 which have been proven to have a strong effect on the social determinants analyzed, such
390 as those of an educational nature. Education is able to create human capital and promote
391 the pre-distribution of income and wealth, remaining to this day the variable with the
392 strongest explanatory power regarding health status and gender differences.
393 To summarize, active employment policies, programs aimed at reducing poverty, and
394 initiatives that complement low income and improve educational opportunities may play
395 a central role in alleviating poverty and improving the population's health.
396 These results are particularly relevant in facing the current post-COVID crisis, as they
397 may help guide public policy in matters of education and income re-distribution with the
398 goal of promoting the post-pandemic recovery of our societies.

399

400 **Acknowledgments**

401 This work was supported by the Health Department of the Regional Andalusian
402 Government (2017–2019) under Grant PI-0457-2016.

403 We thank Professor Manuel Correa for his suggestions and contributions.

404 **Declaration of Interest**

405 None

406

407

408 References

- 409 1. Solar O, Irwin A. A Conceptual Framework for Action on the Social Determinants of Health.
410 Report Document or other Monograph; 2007. Available from:
411 http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/csdh_framework_action_05_07.pdf.
- 412 2. Gueorguieva R, Sindelar JL, Falba TA, Fletcher JM, Keenan P, Wu et al. The Impact of
413 Occupation on Self-Rated Health: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Evidence from the Health
414 and Retirement Survey, *The Journals of Gerontology*. 2009; Series B, 64B(1):118–124. doi:
415 [10.1093/geronb/gbn006](https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbn006)
- 416 3. Alvarez-Galvez J, Rodero-Cosano ML, Motrico E, Salinas-Perez JA, Garcia-Alonso C, Salvador-
417 Carulla L. The Impact of Socio-Economic Status on Self-Rated Health: Study of 29 Countries
418 Using European Social Surveys (2002–2008). *International Journal of Environmental
419 Research Public Health*. 2013;10(3):747-761. doi: [10.3390/ijerph10030747](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph10030747)
- 420 4. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, Houweling TAJ, Taylor S. Closing the gap in a generation: health
421 equity through action on the social determinants of health. *The Lancet*. 2008;
422 372(9650):1661-1669. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)61690-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61690-6)
- 423 5. Braveman P, Gottlieb L. Los determinantes sociales de la salud: es hora de considerar las
424 causas de las causas. *Informes de salud pública*. 2014;129(1_suppl2):19–31. doi:
425 [10.1177/003335491412915206](https://doi.org/10.1177/003335491412915206)
- 426 6. Solar O, Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health:
427 debates, policy and practice. *A Conceptual Framework for Action on the Social Determinants
428 of Health: Debates, Policy & Practice, Case Studies*. Geneva: WHO Document Production
429 Services; 2010. Available from:
430 http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44489/1/9789241500852_eng.pdf.
- 431 7. World Health Organization (WHO). Gender, women and primary health care renewal. A
432 discussion paper. 2010. Available from:
433 [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44430/9789241564038_eng.pdf?sequen
434 ce=1](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44430/9789241564038_eng.pdf?sequence=1).
- 435 8. Coen S, Banister E, editors. What a difference sex and gender make: a gender, sex and health
436 research casebook. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Institutes of Health Research; 2012.
- 437 9. García-Calvente MM, Lozano M, Eguiguren A. Desigualdades de género en el cuidado
438 informal a la salud. *Inguruak: Soziologia eta zientzia politikoaren euskal aldizkaria*. *Revista
439 vasca de sociología y ciencia política*. 2007;44:291-308.
- 440 10. Sen G, Östlin P. Gender inequity in health: why it exists and how we can change it. *Global
441 Public Health*. 2008;3(sup1):1-12. doi:10.1080/17441690801900795
- 442 11. Brzezinski M. What accounts for the rise of low self-rated health during the recent economic
443 crisis in Europe?. *Int J Equity Health*. 2019;18(21). doi:10.1186/s12939-019-0926-1
- 444 12. Stuckler D, Basu S, Suhrcke M, Coutts A, McKee M. The Public Health Effect of Economic
445 Crises and Alternative Policy Responses in Europe: An Empirical Analysis. *Lancet (London,
446 England)*. 2009;374(9686):315-23. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)61124-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61124-7)
- 447 13. Stuckler D, Reeves A, Loopstra R, Karanikolos M, McKee M. Austerity and health: the impact
448 in the UK and Europe, *European Journal of Public Health*. 2017;27(suppl_4, October):18–21.
449 doi: [10.1093/eurpub/ckx167](https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckx167)
- 450 14. Abebe DS, Tøge AG, Dahl E. Individual-level changes in self-rated health before and during
451 the economic crisis in Europe. *Int J Equity Health*. 2016;15:1. doi: [10.1186/s12939-015-0290-
452 8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-015-0290-8)
- 453 15. Tøge AG, Blekesaune M. Unemployment transitions and self-rated health in Europe: a
454 longitudinal analysis of EU-SILC from 2008 to 2011. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015;143:171–8. doi:
455 [10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.08.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.08.040)
- 456 16. Suhrcke M, Stuckler D. Will the Recession Be Bad for Our Health? It Depends. *Social Science
457 & Medicine*. 2012;74(5):647-53. doi: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.011)

- 458 17. Fornell B, Correa M, López del Amo MP, Martín JJ. Influence of changes in the Spanish labor
459 market during the economic crisis (2007-2011) on perceived health. *Quality of Life Research*.
460 2018;1-11. doi: 10.1007/s11136-018-1824-5
- 461 18. Pinillos-Franco S, García-Prieto C. The gender gap in self-rated health and education in Spain.
462 A multilevel analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;Dec 7;12(12). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0187823
- 463 19. Gumà J, Solé-Auró A, Arpino B. Examining social determinants of health: the role of
464 education, household arrangements and country groups by gender, *BMC Public Health*.
465 2019;19(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7054-0
- 466 20. Wärnberg J, Pérez-Farinós N, Ajejas-Bazán MJ, Pérez-López J, Benavente-Marín JC, Crespo-
467 Oliva E et al. Lack of Social Support and Its Role on Self-Perceived Health in a Representative
468 Sample of Spanish Adults. Another Aspect of Gender Inequality. *Journal of Clinique*
469 *Medicine*. 2021;4;10(7):1502. doi: 10.3390/jcm10071502
- 470 21. López del Amo MP, Benítez V, Martín JJ. Long term unemployment, income, poverty, and
471 social public expenditure, and their relationship with self-perceived health in Spain (2007–
472 2011). *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18 (1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-017-5004-2
- 473 22. Calzón S, Fernández A, López del Amo González MP, Martín Martín JJ. Diferencias por sexo
474 de la salud percibida antes y durante la crisis económica (2007 y 2011). *Revista Española de*
475 *Salud Pública*. 2017;91:201702019.
- 476 23. Solé-Auró A, Alcañiz M. Educational attainment, gender and health inequalities among older
477 adults in Catalonia (Spain). *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2016;15:1–12.
- 478 24. Ross CE, Masters RK, Hummer RA. Education and the gender gaps in health and mortality.
479 *Demography*. 2012;49:1157-1183. doi: 10.1007/s13524-012-0130-z
- 480 25. Ross CE, Mirowsky J. Sex differences in the effect of education on depression: resource
481 multiplication or resource substitution? *Soc Sci Med*. 2006;63(5):1400-13. doi:
482 10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.03.013
- 483 26. Ross C E, Mirowsky J. Gender and the Health Benefits of Education, *The Sociological*
484 *Quarterly*. 2010;51:1:1-19. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01164.x
- 485 27. Sen A. Human Capital and Human Capability. *World Development*. 1997;25:1959–1961.
- 486 28. Sen A. (1999) *Development as Freedom*. New York: Knopf; 1999.
- 487 29. Gumà J, Arpino B, Solé-Auró A. Determinantes sociales de la salud de distintos niveles por
488 género: educación y hogar en España. *Gaceta Sanitaria*. 2019;33(2):127-133. doli:
489 10.1016/j.gaceta.2017.11.010
- 490 30. Karlsdotter K, Martín JJ, López del Amo MP. Multilevel analysis of income, income
491 inequalities and health in Spain. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2012;74:1099-1106. doi:
492 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.12.020
- 493 31. Sarti S, Biolcati-Rinaldi F, Vitalini A. The role of individual characteristics and municipalities
494 in social inequalities in perceived health (Italy, 2010–2012): a multilevel study. *J Public*
495 *Health (Berl.)*. 2019;27:21–28. doi: 10.1007/s10389-018-0933-5
- 496 32. Akanni L, Lenhart O, Morton A. Income trajectories and self-rated health status in the UK,
497 *SSM - Population Health*. 2022;17, 101035. doi: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101035
- 498 33. Khullar D, Chokshi DA. Health, income and poverty: where we are & what could help. *Health*
499 *Affairs Health Policy Brief*. 2018;October 4. doi: 10.1377/hpb20180817.901935
- 500 34. Anghel B, Basso H, Bover O, Casado JM, Hospido L, Izquierdo M et al. La desigualdad de la
501 renta, el consumo y la riqueza en España [Inequality of income, consumption and wealth in
502 Spain], *Documentos Ocasionales*. 2018;1806, Banco de España.
- 503 35. World Health Organization (WHO). *The world health report 1999: Making a difference*; 1999.
504 Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/42167/WHR_1999.pdf.
- 505 36. Andersen J, Larsen JE. Gender, poverty and empowerment. *Critical Social Policy*. 1998;
506 18(55):241-258. doi: 10.1177/026101839801805507
- 507 37. Schütte S, Chastang JF, Parent-Thirion A, Vermeylen G, Niedhammer I. Association between
508 Socio-Demographic, Psychosocial, Material and Occupational Factors and Self-Reported

- 509 Health among Workers in Europe. *Journal of Public Health*. 2014;36(2):194-204. doi:
510 10.1093/pubmed/fdt050
- 511 38. Ayllón S, Gábos A. The Interrelationships between the Europe 2020 Poverty and Social
512 Exclusion Indicators. *Social Indicators Research*. 2016;january,1-25. doi: 10.1007/s11205-
513 015-1212-2
- 514 39. Oshio T, Kobayashi M. Income inequality, perceived happiness, and self-rated health:
515 Evidence from nationwide surveys in Japan. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2010;70(9):1358-
516 1366. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.01.010
- 517 40. Amendola A, Dell'Anno R, Parisi L. How did Great Recession affect Gender Disparity in
518 Europe? An analysis by a Multidimensional Deprivation Approach. *Applied Economics*.
519 2020;52(26):2780-2794. doi: 10.1080/00036846.2019.1696934
- 520 41. EAPN (European Anti Poverty Network)-España. El estado de la pobreza: seguimiento del
521 indicador de pobreza y exclusión social en España 2008-2019; 2021. Available from:
522 <https://www.eapn.es/ARCHIVO/documentos/documentos/informe-ARPE-2021->
523 [contexto-nacional.pdf](https://www.eapn.es/ARCHIVO/documentos/documentos/informe-ARPE-2021-).
- 524 42. Bambra C. Work, worklessness and the political economy of health inequalities. *Journal of*
525 *Epidemiology & Community Health*. 2011;65:746-750. doi: 10.1136/jech.2009.102103
- 526 43. Huijts T, McKee M, Reeves A, Stuckler D. Job Loss and Self-Rated Health during the Crisis:
527 The Mitigating Effect of Social Protection Expenditure in 23 European Countries. *Journal of*
528 *Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2014;68(Suppl 1):A65.1–A65. doi: 10.1136/jech-
529 2014-204726.140
- 530 44. Shahidi VF, Siddiqi A, Muntaner C. Does Social Policy Moderate the Impact of
531 Unemployment on Health? A Multilevel Analysis of 23 Welfare States. *The European Journal*
532 *of Public Health*. 2016;26(6):1017–1022. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckw050
- 533 45. Urbanos-Garrido RM, González B. The Influence of the Economic Crisis on the Association
534 between Unemployment and Health: An Empirical Analysis for Spain. *The European Journal*
535 *of Health Economics*. 2015;16(2):175–184. doi: 10.1007/s10198-014-0563-y
- 536 46. Norström F, Virtanen P, Hammarström A, Gustafsson PE, Janlert U. How does
537 unemployment affect self-assessed health? A systematic review focusing on subgroup
538 effects. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):1310. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-1310
- 539 47. Drydak N. The Effect of Unemployment on Self-Reported Health and Mental Health in
540 Greece from 2008 to 2013: A Longitudinal Study before and during the Financial Crisis. *Social*
541 *Science & Medicine*. 2015;128:43–51. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.12.025
- 542 48. Antonakakis N, Collins A. The impact of fiscal austerity on suicide: On the empirics of a
543 modern Greek tragedy. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2014;112,39–50.
- 544 49. World Bank. The Decline of the Breadwinner: Men in the 21st Century. In: *World*
545 *Development Report 2012: Gender Equality*. Washington DC: World Bank; 2011. ch. 3. doi:
546 10.1596/9780821388105_spread2
- 547 50. Robertson S, Gough B, Robinson M. Masculinities and Health Inequalities Within Neoliberal
548 Economies. In: Walker C, Roberts S (editors). *Masculinity, Labour, and Neoliberalism*. Global
549 *Masculinities*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan; 2018. pp. 311-334. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-
550 63172-1_14
- 551 51. Mossakowski KN. The influence of past unemployment duration on symptoms of depression
552 among young women and men in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*.
553 2009;99(10):1826–1832.
- 554 52. Artazcoz L, Benach J, Borrell C, Cortès I. Unemployment and Mental Health: Understanding
555 the Interactions Among Gender, Family Roles, and Social Class *American Journal of Public*
556 *Health*. 2004;94:82-88. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.94.1.82
- 557 53. Ronchetti J, Terriau A. Impact of unemployment on self-perceived health. *European Journal*
558 *of Health Economics*. 2019;20:879–889. doi: 10.1007/s10198-019-01050-5

- 559 54. Buffel V, Van de Velde S, Bracke P. The mental health consequences of the economic crisis
560 in Europe among the employed, the unemployed, and the non-employed, *Social Science*
561 *Research*, 2015;54:263-288, doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.08.003
- 562 55. Ministerio de Sanidad del Gobierno de España. Estadística de Gasto Sanitario Público (EGSP)
563 2019: Principales resultados; 2022. Available from:
564 <https://www.mschs.gob.es/estadEstudios/estadisticas/docs/EGSP2008/egspPrincipalesRes>
565 [ultados.pdf](https://www.mschs.gob.es/estadEstudios/estadisticas/docs/EGSP2008/egspPrincipalesRes).
- 566 56. Gupta S, Verhoeven M, Tiongson ER. Public spending on health care and the poor, *Health*
567 *Econ*. 2003;12:685–696. doi: 10.1002/hec.759
- 568 57. Ray D, Linden M. Health expenditure, longevity, and child mortality: dynamic panel data
569 approach with global data. *Int J Health Econ Manag*. 2020;20:99–119. doi: 10.1007/s10754-
570 019-09272-z
- 571 58. Linden M, Ray D. Life expectancy effects of public and private health expenditures in OECD
572 countries 1970–2012: Panel time series approach. *Economic Analysis and Policy*.
573 2017;56):101-113. doi: 10.1016/j.eap.2017.06.005
- 574 59. Heijink R, Koolman X, Westert GP. Spending more money, saving more lives? The
575 relationship between avoidable mortality and healthcare spending in 14 countries. *The*
576 *European Journal of Health Economics*. 2013;14(3):527-538. doi: 10.1007/s10198-012-
577 0398-3
- 578 60. Nixon J, Ulmann P. The relationship between health care expenditure and health outcomes
579 *European Journal of Health Economics*. 2006;7:7-18. doi: 10.1007/s10198-005-0336-8
- 580 61. Filmer D, Pritchett L. The impact of public spending on health: does money matter? *Social*
581 *Science & Medicine*. 1999;49(10):1309-1323, doi: 10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00150-1
- 582 62. Martin S, Rice N, Smith PC. Does health care spending improve health outcomes? Evidence
583 from English programme budgeting data, *Journal of Health Economics*. 2008;27(4):826-842.
584 doi: 10.1016/j.jhealeco.2007.12.002
- 585 63. Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). Encuesta de condiciones de vida. Resultados. 2022.
586 Available from:
587 https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=12547361768
588 [07&menu=resultados&idp=1254735976608#!tabs-1254736195153](https://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=12547361768).
- 589 64. Rabe-Hesketh S, Skrondal A. Multilevel and longitudinal modeling using Stata (3rd edn.).
590 College Station: Stata Press Publication; 2012.
- 591 65. García Calvente MM, Del Río Lozano M, Marcos Marcos J. Guía de indicadores para medir
592 las desigualdades de género en salud y sus determinantes. Granada: Escuela Andaluza de
593 Salud Pública (EASP); 2015.
- 594 66. De Bruin A. Health Interview Surveys: Towards International Harmonization of Methods and
595 Instruments. WHO Regional Publications, European Series. 1996;58. Office of Publications,
596 WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- 597 67. Bowling A. Research methods in health: investigating health and health services. Berkshire:
598 McGraw-hill education (UK); 2014.
- 599 68. Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). Carencia Material. Carencia Material Severa [Material
600 Deprivation. Severe Material Deprivation]; 2020. Available from:
601 https://www.ine.es/ss/Satellite?L=es_ES&c=INESeccion_C&cid=1259925456180&p=12547
602 [35110672&pagename=ProductosYServicios%2FPYSLayout¶m1=PYSDetalle¶m3=](https://www.ine.es/ss/Satellite?L=es_ES&c=INESeccion_C&cid=1259925456180&p=12547)
603 [1259924822888](https://www.ine.es/ss/Satellite?L=es_ES&c=INESeccion_C&cid=1259925456180&p=12547).
- 604 69. Prus SG, Gee E. Gender Differences in the Influence of Economic, Lifestyle, and Psychosocial
605 Factors on Later-life Health. *Can J Public Health*. 2003;94,306–309. doi:
606 10.1007/BF03403611
- 607 70. Denton M, Prus S, Walters V. Gender differences in health: a Canadian study of the
608 psychosocial, structural and behavioural determinants of health. *Social Science & Medicine*.
609 2004;58(12):2585-2600. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2003.09.008

- 610 71. Gomez-Baya D, Salinas-Perez JA, Rodero-Cosano ML, Gálvez-Álvarez J. Socioeconomic
611 Inequalities in Health Through Lifestyles: Analysing Gender and Age Differences in
612 Andalusia, Spain. *J Community Health*. 2020;45:836–845, doi: 10.1007/s10900-020-00800-
613 4
- 614 72. Scott-Samuel A, Crawshaw P, Oakley A. Men behaving badly – Patriarchy, public policy and
615 health inequalities. *International Journal of Men’s Health*. 2015;14(3):250–258.
- 616 73. Oliffe J, Han C. Beyond workers’ compensation: Men’s mental health in and out of work.
617 *American Journal of Mens’ Health*. 2013;8(1):45–53.